

Application No.: 10/619048

Case No.: 56759US010

**REMARKS**

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The 103(a) rejection based on "de Navas Albareda" is traversed.

A fundamental basis for the obvious rejection is the proposition that the heating to a draw temperature as taught in "de Navas Albareda" would inherently cause relaxation or shrinkage of hook projections. There are two problems with this inherency assumption:

1. The temperature required for relaxation or shrinkage of the invention projections is "near or above the polymer melt temperature" (note page 10 lines 3-10 of the present specification). This is now recited in claim 20.  
The heat treatment in the reference is to facilitate drawing of the backing and would need to be significantly below the polymer melt temperature for the obvious reason that the films would break apart if drawn under tension while the backing was heated to near the polymer melt temperature. Note, for examples, Comparative Example 1 which, exactly like "de Navas Albareda," heats the web while drawing (page 23, lines 10-12) at a temperature of 143° C (the melt temperature for the copolymer used in the example is approximately 160° C).
2. The object in "de Navas Albareda" is to heat treat the base film not the projections so the heat treatment is of the entire web not just the projections. In the present case the treatment of the base film is to be avoided (note page 10, line 8). This is for the reasons discussed above.

A suitable Terminal Disclaimer over allowed copending application 10/396,652 is enclosed.

In view of the above a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

September 7, 2005  
Date

By:

William J. Bond, Reg. No.: 32,400  
Telephone No.: 651-736-4790

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833